UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,491	02/27/2002	J. Mark Dammrose	6541-61172	4920

7590   03/25/2005

One World Trade Center
Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, OR 97204

EXAMINER
ELAHEE, MD S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2645	

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/085,491	DAMMROSE, J. MARK
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Md S Elahee	2645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 October 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 10/25/04. Claims 1-40 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-40 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which is deemed appropriate to address all of the needs at this time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 5, 14, 17, 19-23, 25, 28, 32, 33, 35, 37 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunting et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,393,289) and in view of Patel (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,179).

Regarding claims 1 and 21, Bunting teaches storing call placement and routing information (i.e., correlation information) for a first call leg related to a service request directed to the adjunct 110 (i.e., second switch) by the switch 100 (i.e., first switch) (fig.1-3; col.4, lines 19-24, 57-67, col.7, line 55-col.8, line 3).

Bunting further teaches detecting an attempt to establish a second call leg forming a hairpin loop in conjunction with the first leg (fig.1-3; col.4, lines 19-24, 57-67, col.7, line 55-col.8, line 3).

Bunting further teaches that based at least on detecting the attempt to establish the second call leg forming a hairpin loop in conjunction with the first leg, releasing at least the first call leg (fig.1-3; col.4, lines 57-67, col.7, line 55-col.8, line 3, col.8, lines 43-58).

However, Bunting does not specifically teach "the detecting is based at least on the stored correlation information". Patel teaches that the detecting is based at least on the stored subscriber data (i.e., correlation information) (col.4, lines 10-39). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting to incorporate the detecting based at least on the stored correlation information in order to send new destination number to the serving switch.

Regarding claim 5, Bunting teaches that the detecting takes place during attempted routing of the call to a network (i.e., destination) (fig.1A-1C; col.4, lines 43-67).

Bunting further teaches that the call is routed to a network (fig.1; col.4, lines 43-67).

Regarding claim 14, Bunting teaches control message indicating rerouting of incoming call leg (i.e., consulting trunk type) associated with the rerouting incoming call leg to designated digits (i.e., attempted second leg) (fig.4, steps 415, 425; col.3, lines 10-17).

Regarding claim 17, Bunting teaches the service request is a request for an intelligent network service (i.e., directory assistance) (col.5, lines 1-20).

Bunting further teaches a network (i.e., destination) of the call is determined as a result of the intelligent network service (i.e., directory assistance) (col.5, lines 1-20).

Regarding claim 19, Bunting teaches that the service request is a request for voice-activated dialing (col.4, line 20).

Bunting further teaches that a destination of the call is determined as a result of voice-activated dialing (col.4, lines 19-24, col.5, lines 1-20).

Regarding claim 20, Bunting teaches that the service request is a request for prepaid services (col.4, lines 20, 21).

Regarding claim 22, Bunting teaches at a switch in a telecommunications network, initiating an outgoing call leg, wherein an adjunct entity number (i.e., first identifier) is inherently associated with the outgoing call leg (fig.1-3; col.5, lines 1-20).

Bunting further teaches at the switch, receiving an incoming call leg, wherein a specific destination digits (i.e., second identifier) is associated with the incoming call leg (fig.1-3; col.5, lines 1-20, 30-44).

Bunting further teaches correlating the outgoing call leg and the incoming call leg based at least on the identifiers (fig.1-3; col.5, lines 1-20, 30-44).

Bunting further teaches responsive to correlating the outgoing call leg and the incoming call leg, processing the outgoing call leg and the incoming call leg as a hairpin loop (fig.1-3; col.4, lines 19-24, 57-67, col.5, lines 1-20, 30-44, col.7, line 55-col.8, line 3).

Regarding claim 23, Bunting teaches determining the first identifier from control message (i.e., call setup signaling information) associated with the outgoing call leg (col.5, lines 1-20, 30-44).

Bunting further teaches determining the second identifier from control message (i.e., call setup signaling information) associated with the incoming call leg (col.5, lines 1-20, 30-44).

Regarding claim 25, Bunting teaches releasing the incoming call leg (fig.4; col.8, lines 43-58).

Regarding claims 28 and 32 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Bunting teaches releasing at least the first leg while maintaining connectivity for the call (fig.1-3; col.4, lines 19-24, 57-67, col.5, lines 1-20, 30-44).

However, Bunting does not specifically teach "detecting is based at least on call setup signaling information for the second leg". Patel teaches that the detecting is based at least on the subscriber data (i.e., call setup signaling information) for the second leg (col.3, line 63-col.4, line 39). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting to incorporate detecting based at least on call setup signaling information for the second leg in order to send new destination number to the serving switch.

Regarding claim 33, Bunting teaches receiving at the switch (i.e., redirecting switch) a call for which processing at the adjunct entity (i.e., service platform switch) is to be performed (fig.1-3; col.4, lines 19-24, 57-67, col.7, line 55-col.8, line 3).

Bunting further teaches routing the call as an outgoing call leg to the service platform switch over a trunk out of a trunk group designated as an outgoing hairpin loop trunk type (fig.1-3; col.4, lines 19-24, 57-67, col.7, line 55-col.8, line 3).

However, Bunting fails to teach "the routing comprising sending an Initial Address Message to the service platform switch, the Initial Address Message comprising an outgoing number". Patel teaches the routing comprising sending an Initial Address Message to the tandem node, the Initial Address Message comprising an outgoing number (col.3, line 63-col.4, line 4). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting to allow the routing comprising sending an Initial Address Message to the service platform switch, the Initial Address Message comprising an outgoing number as taught by Patel. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to decide whom the calls should be routed to based on the information of the destination.

Bunting further teaches receiving at the redirecting switch an incoming call leg on a trunk out of a trunk group designated as an incoming hairpin loop trunk type (fig.1-3; col.4, lines 19-24, 57-67, col.7, line 55-col.8, line 3).

However, Bunting further does not specifically teach "the call comprising an Initial Address Message comprising an incoming identifier and a called party number". Patel teaches the call comprising an Initial Address Message comprising an incoming identifier and a called party number (col.3, line 63-col.4, line 39). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting to allow the call comprising an Initial Address Message comprising an incoming identifier and a called party number as

taught by Patel. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to decide particularly whom the calls should be routed to based on the information of the subscriber.

Bunting further does not specifically teach "correlating the outgoing call leg and the incoming call leg by determining that the outgoing number and the incoming identifier are identical". Patel teaches correlating the outgoing call leg and the incoming call leg by determining that the outgoing number and the incoming identifier are identical (col.3, line 63-col.4, line 39). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting to allow correlating the outgoing call leg and the incoming call leg by determining that the outgoing number and the incoming identifier are identical as taught by Patel. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to decide whom the calls should be routed to based on the information of the destination.

Bunting further teaches that responsive to correlating the outgoing call leg and the incoming call leg, releasing the incoming call leg (fig.1-3; col.4, lines 57-67, col.7, line 55-col.8, line 3, col.8, lines 43-58).

Bunting further teaches routing the call to the network (i.e., called party number) (col.5, lines 1-20).

Regarding claim 35, Bunting teaches correlation information retriever logic operable to collect control message (i.e., call setup signaling information) from a call leg directed from the switch to another switch and store the information (fig.1-3; col.5, lines 1-20, 30-44).

Bunting further teaches that incoming call leg monitor logic operable to query (i.e., compare) control message from the call leg directed from the switch with control message from a call leg directed to the switch (col.5, lines 1-20, 30-44).

Bunting further teaches that hairpin loop avoider logic operable to remove at least the call leg directed from the switch to another switch upon detection a control message from the call leg directed from the switch and control message directed to the switch (fig.4; col.5, lines 1-20, 30-44, col.8, lines 43-58).

However, Bunting does not specifically teach "detection of a match between call set up signaling information". Patel teaches detection of a match between call set up signaling information (col.3, line 63-col.4, line 39). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting to allow detection of a match between call set up signaling information as taught by Patel. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to decide whom the calls should be routed to based on the information of the destination. (Note; HLR compares [i.e., matches] the stored subscriber information with the incoming subscriber information)

Regarding claim 37, Bunting teaches a stored pool of identities dedicated for use by the switch software system (col.5, lines 1-20).

Bunting further teaches identity substituter logic for replacing an actual identity with an identity selected from the pool of identities (col.5, lines 1-20).

Regarding claim 40, Bunting teaches changing (i.e., upgrading) at least one switch in the switching system to implement correlation to correlate call legs in the hairpin loop scenario and release at least one call leg in a hairpin loop (fig.4; col.4, lines 5-14, col.5, lines 1-20, 30-44, col.8, lines 43-58).

However, Bunting does not specifically teach responsive to the correlation. Patel teaches responsive to the correlation (col.3, line 63-col.4, line 39, col.6, lines 39-48). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting to allow responsive to the correlation as taught by Patel. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to decide new location of the called party.

Bunting further teaches that the correlation is based on control message (i.e., call setup signaling) supported by the switch, and the switch accommodates a hairpin loop with at least one adjunct entity (i.e., service platform switch) that need not be changed to avoid the hairpin loop scenario (fig.4; col.4, lines 5-14, col.5, lines 1-20, 30-44, col.8, lines 43-58).

5.   Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art and in view of Patel (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,179).

Regarding claim 34, Applicant admitted prior art teaches receiving a first incoming call leg from a call source (page no 1, lines 10, 11 of Background).

Applicant admitted prior art further teaches that providing a first outgoing call leg associated with the first incoming call leg to a service platform switch (page no 1, lines 10-13 of Background).

Applicant admitted prior art further teaches receiving a second incoming call leg from the service platform switch (page no 1, lines 10-14 of Background).

Applicant admitted prior art further teaches providing a second outgoing call leg associated with the second incoming call leg to a destination (page no 1, lines 10-15 of Background).

Applicant admitted prior art further teaches employing the correlation key to correlate the first outgoing call leg with the second incoming call leg (page no 1, lines 10-14 of Background).

Applicant admitted prior art further teaches connecting the first incoming call leg to the second outgoing call leg (page no 1, lines 10-15 of Background).

However, Applicant admitted prior art does not specifically teach that the first outgoing call leg and the second incoming call leg comprises a correlation key. Patel teaches that the first outgoing call leg and the second incoming call leg comprises a subscriber data (i.e., correlation key) (col.4, lines 10-39). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Applicant admitted prior art to incorporate the first outgoing call leg and the second incoming call leg comprising a correlation key in order to make a connection between two parties.

Applicant admitted prior art further does not specifically teach employing the correlation key to correlate the first outgoing call leg with the second incoming call leg. Patel teaches employing the subscriber data (i.e., correlation key) to correlate the first outgoing call leg with the second incoming call leg (col.4, lines 10-39). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Applicant admitted prior art to incorporate the first outgoing call leg and the second incoming call leg comprising a correlation key in order to form a tromboning of call connection.

6.   Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giuhat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,145) and in view of Bunting et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,393,289).

Regarding claim 38, Giuhat teaches storing Initial Address Message for a call leg directed from the first switch to the second switch as correlation information (col.4, lines 52-55, col.6, lines 60-67, col.8, lines 3-35; 'Initial Address Message' reads on the claim 'call setup signaling information').

Giuhat further teaches comparing the correlation information against Initial Address Message for a call leg directed from the second switch back to the first switch (col.6, lines 60-67, col.8, lines 3-35; 'Initial Address Message' reads on the claim 'call setup signaling information').

Giuhat further teaches means operable to detect a match between the correlation information and the Initial Address Message for the call leg directed from the second switch back to the first switch and further operable for removing the call leg directed from the first switch to the second switch and the call leg directed from the second switch back to the first switch after detecting the match (col.7, lines 41-54, col.8, lines 3-67; 'Initial Address Message' reads on the claim 'call setup signaling information').

However, Giuhat does not specifically teach removing the call leg. Bunting teaches releasing (i.e., removing) the call leg (fig.1-3; col.4, lines 57-67, col.7, line 55-col.8, line 3, col.8, lines 43-58). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Giuhat to remove the call leg in order to establish talk path without hairpin loop.

Regarding claim 39, Giuhat teaches temporary identifier selection logic operable to select a temporary identifier (col.8, lines 3-61).

Giuhat further teaches substitution logic operable to substitute the temporary identifier for an identifier related with a call leg for use as the correlation information (col.8, lines 3-61).

Giuhat further teaches restoration logic operable to restore the identifier related with the call leg after the match is detected (col.8, lines 3-61).

7.   Claims 2-4, 6-11, 15, 16, 24, 26, 27, 30, 31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunting et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,393,289) and in view of Patel (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,179) and further in view of Giuhat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,145).

Regarding claim 2, Bunting in view of Patel fails to teach "comparing call setup signaling information associated with the first leg with call signaling information associated with the attempted second leg". Giuhat teaches comparing Initial Address Message associated with the first leg with Initial Address Message associated with the attempted second leg (fig.3; Table A-4; col.6, lines 60-67, col.7, lines 42-67, col.8, lines 1, 2; 'Initial Address Message' reads on the claim 'call setup signaling information'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting in view of Patel to allow

comparing call setup signaling information associated with the first leg with call signaling information associated with the attempted second leg as taught by Giuhat. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to decide whom the calls should be routed to based on the information of the subscriber.

Regarding claim 3, Bunting in view of Patel fails to teach "comparing calling party number signaling information associated with the first leg with calling party number signaling information associated with the attempted second leg". Giuhat teaches comparing Initial Address Message associated with the first leg with Initial Address Message associated with the attempted second leg (fig.3; Table A-4; col.6, lines 60-67, col.7, lines 42-67, col.8, lines 1, 2; 'Initial Address Message' reads on the claim 'calling party number signaling information'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting in view of Patel to allow comparing calling party number signaling information associated with the first leg with calling party number signaling information associated with the attempted second leg as taught by Giuhat. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to route the call to the proper destination.

Regarding claims 4 and 6, Bunting in view of Patel fails to teach "comparing billing number signaling information associated with the first leg with billing number signaling information associated with the attempted second leg". Giuhat teaches comparing Initial Address Message associated with the first leg with Initial Address Message associated with the attempted second leg (fig.3; Table A-4; col.6, lines 60-67, col.7, lines 42-67, col.8, lines 1, 2; 'Initial Address Message' reads on the claim 'billing number signaling information'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

modify Bunting in view of Patel to allow comparing billing number signaling information associated with the first leg with billing number signaling information associated with the attempted second leg as taught by Giuhat. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to decide specifically whom the calls should be routed to based on the information of the called party.

Regarding claim 7, Bunting teaches that the control message (i.e., call setup signaling information) originates from a format of a redirection directive utilized in ANSI-41 (i.e., initial address message as part of ANSI-ISUP signaling) (col.5, lines 30-44, col.9, lines 22-38).

Regarding claim 8, Bunting teaches that the control message (i.e., call setup signaling information) comprises a calling party identifier (col.5, lines 30-44).

Regarding claim 9, Bunting teaches that the control message comprises a prepaid (i.e., charge) number (col.4, lines 20, 21).

Regarding claim 10, Bunting teaches that the control message comprises a charge number and a calling party number (col.4, lines 20-24, col.5, lines 30-44).

Regarding claim 11, Bunting in view of Patel fails to teach "the call setup signaling information originates from a setup message as part of ISDN-PRI signaling". Giuhat teaches that the call setup signaling information originates from an initial address message as part of ISDN-PRI signaling (Table A-4; col.5, lines 54-57, col.6, lines 5-10, 60-67, col.7, lines 42-67, col.8, lines 1, 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting in view of Patel to allow the call setup signaling information originating from a setup message as part of ISDN-PRI signaling as taught by Giuhat.

The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to control the access of the signaling network.

Regarding claim 15, Bunting in view of Patel fails to teach "comparing trunk membership associated with the attempted second leg against a list of trunks designated for comparison". Giuhat teaches trunk membership associated with the attempted second leg against a list of trunks designated for comparison (col.7, lines 41-54). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting in view of Patel to allow comparing trunk membership associated with the attempted second leg against a list of trunks designated for comparison as taught by Giuhat. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to avoid the tromboning connection.

Regarding claim 16, Bunting in view of Patel fails to teach "selecting a temporary identity from a pool of identities". Giuhat teaches selecting a temporary identity from a pool of identities (col.8, lines 3-61). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting in view of Patel to allow selecting a temporary identity from a pool of identities as taught by Giuhat. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to complete the call to the ported directory number.

Bunting in view of Patel fails to teach "substituting the temporary identity for an actual identity associated with the call". Giuhat teaches substituting the temporary identity for an actual identity associated with the call (col.8, lines 3-61). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting in view of Patel to allow substituting the temporary identity for an actual identity associated with the call as taught

by Giuhat. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to route the call to the particular subscriber.

Regarding claim 24, Bunting teaches determining the first identifier from a prepaid (i.e., billing) number parameter associated control message (i.e., call setup signaling information) associated with the outgoing call leg (fig.1-3; col.4, lines 19-24, col.5, lines 1-20, 30-44).

Bunting further teaches determining the second identifier from a prepaid number parameter associated control message associated with the incoming call leg (fig.1-3; col.4, lines 19-24, col.5, lines 1-20, 30-44).

Regarding claim 26, Bunting in view of Patel fails to teach "parking a call leg". Giuhat teaches parking a call leg (col.7, lines 41-54). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting in view of Patel to allow parking a call leg as taught by Giuhat. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to route the call leg.

Bunting in view of Patel further fails to teach "applying silence to the parked call leg". Giuhat teaches applying silence to the parked call leg (col.7, lines 41-54). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting in view of Patel to allow applying silence to the parked call leg as taught by Giuhat. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to allow some time to seize the trunk and route the call to the recipient.

Regarding claim 27, Bunting teaches releasing the outgoing call leg (fig.4; col.8, lines 43-58).

Regarding claim 30, Bunting in view of Patel fails to teach "the call setup signaling information for the second leg comprises a parameter from an Initial Address Message according to an ISUP signaling protocol". Giuhat teaches that the call setup signaling information for the second leg comprises a parameter from an Initial Address Message according to an ISUP signaling protocol (Table A-4; col.6, lines 5-10, 60-67, col.7, lines 42-67, col.8, lines 1, 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting in view of Patel to allow the call setup signaling information for the second leg comprising a parameter from an Initial Address Message according to an ISUP signaling protocol leg as taught by Giuhat. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to control the access of the signaling network.

Regarding claim 31, Bunting in view of Patel fails to teach "the call setup signaling information for the second leg comprises a Calling Party Number parameter from a Setup Message according to an ISDN-PRI signaling protocol". Giuhat teaches that the call setup signaling information for the second leg comprises a Calling Party Number parameter from a Setup Message according to an ISDN-PRI signaling protocol (Table A-4; col.5, lines 54-57, col.6, lines 5-10, 60-67, col.7, lines 42-67, col.8, lines 1, 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting in view of Patel to allow the call setup signaling information for the second leg comprising a Calling Party Number parameter from a Setup Message according to an ISDN-PRI signaling protocol as taught by Giuhat. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to control the access of the signaling network.

8.   Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunting in view

of Patel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,393,289) and in view of Patel (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,179) and

further in view of Giuhat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,145) and further in view of Bhagat et al.

(U.S. Patent No. 5,550,911).

Regarding claim 12, Bunting in view of Patel in view of Giuhat fails to teach "the call

setup signaling information originates from RI Feature Group-D signaling comprising an

Automatic Number Identification field". Bhagat teaches that the call setup signaling information

originates from RI Feature Group-D signaling comprising an Automatic Number Identification

field (col.3, lines 18-26, col.5, lines 52-67). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting in view of Patel in view of

Giuhat to have the call setup signaling information originating from RI Feature Group-D

signaling comprising an Automatic Number Identification field as taught by Bhagat. The

motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to decide whom the calls should be

routed to based on the information of the subscriber.

9.   Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunting in view

of Patel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,393,289) and in view of Patel (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,179) and

further in view of Giuhat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,145) and further in view of Persson et al.

(U.S. Patent No. 6,052,589).

Regarding claim 13, Bunting in view of Patel in view of Giuhat fails to teach "the call

setup signaling information originates in a GSM network". Persson teaches that the call setup

signaling information originates in a GSM network (col.7, lines 12-17). Thus, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting

in view of Patel in view of Giuhat to have the call setup signaling information originating in a

GSM network as taught by Persson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in

order to extend the range of at least two service networks having different specified signaling

standards.

10.   Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunting et al.

(U.S. Patent No. 6,393,289) and in view of Patel (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,179) and further in view

of O'Brien (U.S. Patent No. 6,601,031).

Regarding claim 18, Bunting in view of Patel fails to teach "the service request is a

request for accessing voicemail messages". Persson teaches that the service request is a request

for accessing voice mail system (fig.3; col.3, lines 10-15; 'voice mail system' reads on the claim

'voicemail messages'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Bunting in view of Patel to have the service request as a

request for accessing voicemail messages as taught by Persson. The motivation for the

modification is to have doing so in order to determine the recipient information.

Bunting in view of Patel further fails to teach "a destination of the call is determined as a

result of accessing voicemail messages". Persson teaches that a destination of the call is

determined as a result of accessing voicemail messages (fig.3; col.3, lines 10-15, 52, 53; 'voice

mail system' reads on the claim 'voicemail messages'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting in view of Patel

to have a destination of the call determined as a result of accessing voicemail messages as taught

by Persson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to determine the recipient information.

11.   Claims 29 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunting et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,393,289) and in view of Patel (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,179) and further in view of Bhagat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,911).

Regarding claims 29 and 36, Bunting in view of Patel fails to teach "the call setup signaling information for the second leg comprises an Automatic Number Identification parameter". Bhagat teaches that the call setup signaling information for the second leg comprises an Automatic Number Identification parameter (col.3, lines 18-26, col.5, lines 52-67). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunting in view of Patel to have the call setup signaling information for the second leg comprising an Automatic Number Identification parameter as taught by Bhagat. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to decide whom the calls should be routed to based on the information of the subscriber.

Conclusion

12.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Smidt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,610) teach Cooperative call processing across public and private intelligent networks and Walker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,664,010) teach System and method for providing an improved telecommunications service node.

13.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S Elahee whose telephone number is (703)305-4822. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (703)305-4895. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.E.
MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE
March 17, 2005

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600